REMARKS

Objection to Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because features in claims 3, 9, and 11-15 were allegedly not shown in the drawings. Claims 3, 9 and 11-15 have been canceled herein, thereby traversing the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Objections to claims 3 and 5

The Examiner objected to typographical errors in claims 3 and 5. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled herein, thereby traversing the Examiner's objection to claims 3 and 5.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wright

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wright. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claim 16 as originally filed is still pending. In the rejection, the Examiner failed to address each and every limitation in claim 16, and therefore failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Wright.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami. Claims 1, 2, and 6-8 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ohara

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ohara. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claims 16-18 as originally filed are still pending. In the rejection, the Examiner failed to address each and every limitation in claims 16-18, and therefore failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Ohara.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bunyea

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bunyea. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. In the rejection, the Examiner failed to address each and every limitation in claims 16-18, and therefore failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bunyea.

Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mizumura

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mizumura. Claim 1 has been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright. Claim 9 has been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami. Claim 9 has been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Rejection of claims 4, 5, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Simpson

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Simpson. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claim 19 as originally filed is still pending. In the rejection, the Examiner failed to address each and every limitation in claim 19, and therefore failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Neither Murakami nor Simpson teach a battery pack as recited in claim 19. For this reason, the combination of Murakami and Simpson cannot teach all of the limitations in claim 19. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Murakami and Simpson.

Rejection of claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Kobayashi

The Examiner rejected claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Kobayashi. Claims 11-15 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of Mizumura

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of Mizumura. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled herein, and therefore need not be addressed.

Next Office Action

Claims 16-19 as originally filed are currently pending. Should the Examiner decide to reject any of claims 16-19 in the next office action, applicants forcefully assert that such an action should be non-final, because the Examiner did not establish a prima facie case for rejecting any of the pending claims in the first office action. Applicants invite the Examiner to clearly map the teachings of the cited art on each and every limitation in the pending claims so the Examiner's rejections may be adequately addressed on appeal, if necessary.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Derek P. Martin

Reg. No. 36,595

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C. P.O. Box 548 Carthage, MO 64836-0548 (417) 358-4700